



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY  
DENMARK

## Triumphal Chariots, Emperor Worship and Dio Cassius

*Declined Triumphal Honours*

Lange, Carsten Hjort

*Published in:*  
Analecta Romana Instituti Danici

*Publication date:*  
2016

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*  
Lange, C. H. (2016). Triumphal Chariots, Emperor Worship and Dio Cassius: Declined Triumphal Honours. *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*, 40/41, 21-33. [http://www.acdan.it/analecta/analecta\\_40\\_41.htm](http://www.acdan.it/analecta/analecta_40_41.htm)

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

### Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

ANALECTA ROMANA

INSTITUTI DANICI

XL/XLI

2015/16

---

ROMAE MMXV-MMXVI

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI XL-XLI

© 2016 Accademia di Danimarca

ISSN 2035-2506

Published with the support of a grant from:

*Det Frie Forskningsråd / Kultur og Kommunikation*

SCIENTIFIC BOARD

Ove Hornby (*Bestyrelsesformand, Det Danske Institut i Rom*, -31.03.2016)

Karoline Prien Kjeldsen (*Bestyrelsesformand, Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Jens Bertelsen (*Bertelsen & Schering Arkitekter*)

Maria Fabricius Hansen (*Ny Carlsbergfondet*)

Peter Fibiger Bang (*Københavns Universitet*)

Thomas Harder (*Forfatter/ writer/ scrittore*)

Michael Herslund (*Copenhagen Business School*)

Hanne Jansen (*Københavns Universitet*)

Kurt Villads Jensen (*Syddanske Universitet*)

Erik Vilstrup Lorenzen (*Den Danske Ambassade i Rom*)

Mogens Nykjær (*Aarhus Universitet*)

Vinnie Nørskov (*Aarhus Universitet*)

Birger Riis-Jørgensen (*Den Danske Ambassade i Rom*)

Niels Rosing-Schow (*Det Kgl. Danske Musikonservatorium*)

Poul Schüleim (*Arkitema, København*)

Lene Schøsler (*Københavns Universitet*)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Marianne Pade (*Chair of Editorial Board, Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Patrick Kragelund (*Danmarks Kunstbibliotek*)

Sine Grove Saxkjær (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Gert Sørensen (*Københavns Universitet*)

Anna Wegener (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Maria Adelaide Zocchi (*Det Danske Institut i Rom*)

Analecta Romana Instituti Danici. — Vol. I (1960) — . Copenhagen: Munksgaard. From 1985: Rome, «L'ERMA» di Bretschneider. From 2007 (online): Accademia di Danimarca

ANALECTA ROMANA INSTITUTI DANICI encourages scholarly contributions within the Academy's research fields. All contributions will be peer reviewed. Manuscripts to be considered for publication should be sent to: [accademia@acdan.it](mailto:accademia@acdan.it) Authors are requested to consult the journal's guidelines at [www.acdan.it](http://www.acdan.it)

## Contents

MATTEO CADARIO: <i>L'ostentazione del lusso nel trionfo di Cn. Manlio Vulsone e la funzione di abaci e kylikeia nel modo ellenistico e romano</i>	7
CARSTEN HJORT LANGE: <i>Triumphal Chariots, Emperor Worship and Dio Cassius: Declined Triumphal Honours</i>	21
HANS RAMMINGER: <i>Language Change in Humanist Latin: the case of traducere (to translate)</i>	35
MORTEN STEEN HANSEN: <i>Butchering the Bull of St. Luke: Unpublished Writings by and about the Painter-Poet Giovanni da San Giovanni</i>	63
LENE ØSTERMARK-JOHANSEN: <i>In the Footsteps of Winckelmann: Vernon Lee in the Roman Galleries at the Fin de Siècle</i>	91



# Triumphal Chariots, Emperor Worship and Dio Cassius: Declined Triumphal Honours

by CARSTEN HJORT LANGE

*Abstract.* This article sets out to identify the links between triumphal chariots and emperor worship during the reign of Augustus. The triumphal chariot became part of substitute-honours replacing the triumph proper, simultaneously becoming associated with the worship of the living princeps. Dio Cassius, our main source for emperor worship under Augustus, deliberately falsified his historical narrative on the matter. His claim that there was no cult in Italy to the living Augustus has already been proven wrong by Gradel (1992; 2002). This article offers an explanation as to why that is: Dio Cassius claims that during the reign of Augustus no Roman citizen took part in worship of the living emperor (51.20.6-8). This is untrue, but essential to his purpose, because he required a model emperor with which he could construct a historical consensus on the issue of worship of the living emperor.

Perhaps the best description of what has aptly been called ‘triumphal rulership’ (McCormick 1986) is found in the *Res Gestae* (RG) of Augustus, especially chapter 4:<sup>1</sup>

[Bis] ovans triumphavi et tri[s] egi  
curulis triumphos et appella[tus sum  
v]iciens et semel imperator, [decernente  
pl]uris triumphos mihi sena[t]u, qu[ibus  
omnibus su]persedi. L[aurum de f]asc[i]bus  
deposui in Capi[torio], votis quae] quoque  
bello nuncupaveram [sol]utis. Ob res a [me  
aut per legatos] meos auspiciis meis terra  
ma[trique] pr[o]spere gestas qui[n]quagens  
et q[ui]nquiens decrevit senatus  
supp[lica]ndum esse dis immortalibus.  
Dies a[utem], pe[r] quos ex senatus consulto  
[s]upplicatum est, fuere DC[CCLXXXX].  
In triumphis meis] ducti sunt ante  
currum meum reges aut r[eg]um lib[eri]  
novem. Consul f]ueram terdeciens, cum

[scribeb]a[m] haec, [et eram se]ptimum et  
t[ricen]simu[m] tribuniciae potestatis.

I celebrated two triumphal ovations and three curule triumphs, and I have been hailed twenty-one times as victorious general, although the senate voted me more triumphs, from all of which I abstained. I deposited the laurel from my *fascēs* in the Capitoline temple, in fulfilment of the vows which I had taken in each war. On account of affairs successfully accomplished by land and sea by me or through my deputies under my auspices the Senate fifty-five times decreed that thanksgiving should be offered to the immortal gods. Moreover the days during which thanksgiving had been offered by decree of the Senate have amounted to 890. In my triumphs nine kings or kings’ children

have been led in front of my chariot.  
I had been consul thirteen times at the  
time of writing, and I was the holder  
of tribunician power thirty-seven times  
[trans. Cooley 2009, adapted].

Augustus begins with the triumphs and ovations he celebrated and ends with his magistracies: his consulships and the number of times he held the powers of the tribune are mentioned last, almost as an afterthought. Having stated that he declined triumphs after 29 BCE, he mentions that he was hailed as *imperator* twenty-one times. The triumph was far too important only to be used in the triumphal ritual itself.<sup>2</sup> Augustus' funeral procession included a wax image of Augustus in triumphal garb, a triumphal chariot carrying his image, and images of the nations he had conquered (Dio Cass. 56.34.1-3). The key theme here was the need of the great civil war commander and victor to give full expression to his prestige and charisma, and at the same time to legitimise his power (see also Lange 2013). This article seeks to explore the interdependent development of triumphal chariots and emperor worship. It will also challenge the claim of Dio Cassius that there was no worship of the living princeps in Italy (as Gradel 1992; 2002), by focusing mainly on why he, or so I believe, deliberately falsified his narrative on the matter.

A 'newly discovered' relief has recently been on display in Rome (2013-2014) at the exhibition commemorating the bimillennium of Augustus' death. The relief has now been published in entirety for the first time, courtesy of Thomas Schäfer (2013). A post-Augustan date is the most feasible.<sup>3</sup> The slabs are from left to right (the order of slabs in the Rome exhibition, a reconstruction as proposed by Thomas Schäfer; see Schäfer 2013, 321-323): Apollo (1, fragmented) overlooking the battle of Actium (1-4), the Actium triumph (5), trumpeters, flutist, *lictors* etc. (6, fragmented, and 7), Victoria (8), Mars and Roma (9), a naval commander (10) and the processional wagon (*tensa*, carrying a god's *exuviae*) of the

Deified Augustus (11).<sup>4</sup> The context makes it unlikely that this relief shows anything but the battle of Actium: Apollo is overlooking the battle of Actium, with lyre, tripod, and a ship clearly visible (Verg. *Aen.* 8.704-8). After the battle the victorious Young Caesar is granted and subsequently celebrates a triumph. The relief somewhat surprisingly depicts civil war (the soldiers fighting each other are neither Egyptian nor Eastern, but Romans, as the uniforms are the same: Romans fighting Romans equals a civil war), but it does focus, as does Augustus in the *Res Gestae* (esp. chapter 34), on the positive outcome of the war: victory, triumph and, as a result, peace.<sup>5</sup> The deification of Augustus thus became the logical result of his deeds, primarily the victory at Actium.

Schäfer and Murray both suggest that it is from a centre of imperial cult.<sup>6</sup> Augustus was deified after his death, and it is his funeral or processional wagon of the Deified Augustus probably shown on the relief. The processional wagon (*tensa*) thus was used as a symbol of Augustus' deification on the relief (so already Schäfer 2002, 45-46). Interestingly, Suetonius (*Claud.* 11.2) mentions the processional wagon of Augustus and Livia as *currus*, often used in connection with the triumphal chariot. The connection between triumph and the reversed triumph at Augustus' funeral stands.<sup>7</sup> Dio Cass. (56.34.1-4) is the key passage, worth quoting in its entirety.

ταῦτα μὲν αἱ ἐντολαὶ εἶχον, μετὰ  
δὲ τοῦτο ἡ ἐκφορὰ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο.  
κλίνη ἦν ἐκ τε ἐλέφαντος καὶ  
χρυσοῦ πεποιημένη καὶ στρώμασιν  
άλουργοῖς διαχρύσοις κεκοσμημένη:  
καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ μὲν σῶμα κάτω  
που ἐν θήκῃ συνεκέκρυπτο, εἰκὼν  
δὲ δὴ τις αὐτοῦ κηρίνῃ ἐν ἐπινικίῳ  
στολῇ ἐξεφαίνετο. καὶ αὕτη μὲν  
ἐκ τοῦ παλατίου πρὸς τῶν ἐς  
νέωτα ἀρχόντων, ἑτέρα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ  
βουλευτηρίου χρυσοῦ, καὶ ἑτέρα αὖ  
ἐφ' ἄρματος πομπικοῦ ἤγετο. καὶ  
μετὰ ταύτας αἰτετῶν προπατόρων

αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τῶν ἄλλων συγγενῶν  
τῶν τεθνηκότων, πλὴν τῆς τοῦ  
Καίσαρος ὅτι ἐς τοὺς ἥρωας  
ἐσεγγράπτο, αἱ τε τῶν ἄλλων  
Ῥωμαίων τῶν καὶ καθ' ὅτιοῦν  
πρωτευσάντων, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ  
Ῥωμύλου ἀρξάμεναι, ἐφέροντο. καί  
τις καὶ τοῦ Πομπηίου τοῦ μεγάλου  
εἰκὼν ὥφθη, τὰ τε ἔθνη πάνθ' ὅσα  
προσεκτήσατο, ἐπιχωρίως σφίσιν  
ὡς ἕκαστα ἀπηκασμένα ἐπέμφθη.  
κὰκ τούτου καὶ τὰ ἄλλα αὐτοῖς,  
ὅσα ἐν τοῖς ἄνω λόγοις εἴρηται,  
ἐφέσπετο. προτεθείσης δὲ τῆς κλίνης  
ἐπὶ τοῦ δημηγορικοῦ βήματος, ἀπὸ  
μὲν ἐκείνου ὁ Δροῦσός τι ἀνέγνω,  
ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν ἐτέρων ἐμβόλων τῶν  
Ἰουλιέων ὁ Τιβέριος δημόσιον δὴ  
τινα κατὰ δόγμα λόγον ἐπ' αὐτῷ  
τοιόνδε ἐπελέξατο;

Then came his [Augustus'] funeral.  
There was a couch made of ivory and  
gold adorned with coverings of purple  
and gold. In it his body was hidden, in a  
coffin down below; but a wax image of  
him in triumphal garb was visible. This  
image was borne from the palace by the  
officials elected for the following year,  
and another of gold from the Senate  
house, and still another upon a triumphal  
chariot. Behind these came the images  
of his ancestors and of his deceased  
relatives (except that of Caesar, because  
he had been numbered among the *divi*)<sup>8</sup>  
and those of other Romans who had  
been prominent in any way, beginning  
with Romulus himself. An image of  
Pompeius the Great was also seen, and  
all the nations he had acquired, each  
represented by a likeness which bore  
some local characteristic, appeared in  
the procession. After these followed  
all the other objects mentioned above.  
When the couch had been placed in  
full view of the Rostra of the orators,  
Drusus read something from that place;  
and from the other Rostra, that is the

Julian, Tiberius delivered the following  
public address over the deceased, in  
pursuance of a decree;

ἐκ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου... ἐφ' ἄρματος  
πομπικοῦ (“a second image, of gold, from  
the Senate house, and still another on a  
triumphal chariot” [trans. Swan 2004]) is  
interesting, as it mentions a triumphal chariot  
used at the funeral.<sup>9</sup> We should assume that  
this was the 29 BCE triumphal chariot of  
Augustus. It may have been similar to the  
one on the Boscoreale Cups, as suggested  
by Kuttner.<sup>10</sup> According to Kuttner, Tiberius  
used Augustus' chariot in his triumph, as did  
Nero (Suet., *Ner.* 25.1).

According to Cassiodorus (*Chronica: Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctorum Antiquissimorum* 11): “Caesari ex provinciis redeunti currus cum corona aurea decretus est, quo ascendere noluit” (When Caesar returned from the provinces, he was decreed a chariot along with a golden crown, but refused to mount the chariot). Augustus was given a chariot and a golden crown (*currus cum corona aurea*) in 19 BCE. This is allegedly confirmed by coins.<sup>11</sup> The SC on some of the coins point to a decree of the Senate.<sup>12</sup> We know that an ovation was declined in 20 BCE, but the chariot together with honours shown on coinage may infer that after the first decree another was voted, this time a curule triumph.<sup>13</sup> This may also be connected to the right to ride in chariot in Rome in triumphal dress at all times, an honour already given to Caesar in 44 BCE.<sup>14</sup>

According to Rich the chariot was finally placed in Augustus' new forum, empty, without a statue of Augustus.<sup>15</sup> In 46 BCE Caesar was perhaps honoured with a chariot without a statue.<sup>16</sup> Further regarding triumphal chariots, Young Caesar erected a chariot in honour of Antonius on the Rostra after he had executed Sextus Pompeius.<sup>17</sup> Indeed, even Marius, Sulla and Pompeius may have been honoured with chariots with their statues.<sup>18</sup> The spectrum from “regular republican” honours to honours of worship



was a wide one. But can we really be sure of the link between the Cassiodorus' *currus*, the Hispanic coin of 19–18 BCE<sup>19</sup> and the triumphal chariot in the Forum of Augustus, or alternatively, the Italian coins from just after Actium?<sup>20</sup> And can we really believe that the cornerstone of the new forum, a triumphal chariot, inscribed with the title *pater patriae*,<sup>21</sup> given as an honour to Augustus by the Senate, as mentioned prominently in *Res Gestae* 35, was empty? (On the coins the head of Augustus is at least shown on the obverse). The coins refer to the honour, but the actual forum *quadriga* is an entirely different matter. Would anybody have understood what the empty chariot represented? The description of the funeral of Augustus by Dio Cassius speaks volumes: a triumphal chariot in the procession contained an image of Augustus (56.34.2). A similar chariot (*quadriga*) is also mentioned in *Res Gestae* 24, emphasising how Augustus had statues removed:

In templis omnium civitatum prov[inci]ae Asiae victor ornamenta reposui quae spoliatis tem[plis] is] cum quo bellum gesseram privatim possederat. Statuae [meae] pedestres et equestres et in quadrigis argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli, exque ea pecunia dona aurea in aede Apollinis meo nomine et illorum qui mihi statuarum honorem habuerunt posui.

As victor, I replaced in the temples of all the cities in the province of Asia the ornaments which the man against whom I had waged war had held in his private possession after plundering the temples. The eighty or so statues made of silver, depicting me on foot, on horseback, and in a four-horse chariot, which stood in the city, I myself removed, and from the money realized I placed golden gifts in the temple of Apollo in my name and in the name of those who had honoured me with the statues. [Trans. Cooley 2009].

These chariots are symbols of triumph (Prop. 4.11.11–12; Florus 2.13.89); indeed the word *currus* could be used as a synonym of triumph (Plin. *HN* 5.36), although this is not always the case – Suetonius (*Claud.* 11.2) uses the word for the elephant chariot/processional wagon at the circus.<sup>22</sup> But there is more: Pekáry suggests that the silver statues were being melted down and that the silver was used to make coins (*denarii*).<sup>23</sup> But Young Caesar would have had the riches of Egypt and therefore did not need to melt down statues in Rome. Augustus was probably displaying modesty; silver statues to Young Caesar, and golden tripods to Apollo.<sup>24</sup> Chapter 24 of the *Res Gestae* is datable as Young Caesar is termed victor, the context suggesting Actium, which is mentioned in *Res Gestae* 25.2. Furthermore, the Temple of Apollo was dedicated in 28 BCE, although the statues may of course have been put up earlier. The chapter describes the crimes of Antonius, the unmentioned adversary,<sup>25</sup> put to right by Young Caesar, returning temple ornaments to the rightful owners. Apollo is clearly connected to the victory at Actium. This chapter echoes the list of triumphs in chapter 4, including that for Actium. In 4.3 Augustus mentions *ante currum* (*in triumphis*), whereas in 4.1 he uses *ovans triumphavi* and *curulis triumphos*. Furthermore, the term *quadriga* is used in chapter 35.1, as in 24.2. The term suggests triumphal honours. The use of the chariot was otherwise restricted to gods, kings, warriors in battle and athletes at races.<sup>26</sup> In republican Rome it was normally forbidden to ride one inside the city, but there are exceptions: L. Caecilius Metellus was entitled to drive a chariot to the Senate in recognition of his heroic conduct during the First Punic War, blinded while saving the *Palladium* from the Temple of Vesta (Plin. *HN* 7.141). Usually, however, this was only allowed in triumph.<sup>27</sup>

Stewart (2003, 172–3) writes of unparalleled gifts in Rome, more suitable for Hellenistic kings. They are responses to Actium and given by the cities to which Augustus had returned the statues stolen by Antonius.

Cooley (2009, 212) agrees that this concerns statues dedicated by Greek cities in Rome, due to the mention of Asia and Augustus' enemy in the previous sentence. However, in the city, chariots, when associated with triumph, was as an honour given by the *SPQR*, not by Greek cities. There is, or so I believe, another issue at hand: Suetonius (himself critical of emperor worship; see Wardle 2012) refers to the act of melting down statues in connection with ruler worship (*Aug.* 52):

Templa, quamvis sciret etiam proconsulibus decerni solere, in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit. Nam in urbe quidem pertinacissime abstinuit hoc honore; atque etiam argenteas statuas olim sibi positas conflavit omnis exque iis aureas cortinas Apollini Palatino dedicavit.

Although well aware that it was usual to vote temples even to proconsuls, he would not accept one even in a province save jointly in his own name and that of Rome. In the city itself he refused this honour most emphatically, even melting down the silver statues which had been set up in his honour in former times and with the money coined from them dedicating golden tripods to Apollo on the Palatine (cf. *Aug.* 59-60; see Wardle 2012, 311-312).

This is the same story as told in *Res Gestae* 24. At the outset this seems a statement of policy; something consistent with the policy of Augustus. Dio Cassius (53.22.3) also tells the story, as part of his digression on imperial finances, and thus it may not have taken place in 27 BCE (book 53). Furthermore, in Maecenas' Speech (Dio Cass. 52.35.1-6) Augustus is advised never to allow the erection of silver and gold images that depicted him, nor to accept temples in his honour. This is reasonable, but Augustus was no doubt "special": in chapter 9 of the *Res*

*Gestae* the name of Augustus was inserted into the hymn of the *Salii*. According to Dio Cassius (51.19.2) games were to be held at Rome (*quinquennales*), *pro salute Caesaris*; they did not survive Augustus, as they were linked to his *salus*. And in chapter 12 the Augustan Peace Altar (*Ara Pacis Augustae*) connects the name of Augustus and the divine quality *pax*.<sup>28</sup> Dio Cassius (54.35.2) also tells a story from 11 BCE, in which money intended for statues of Augustus is instead used for statues of *Salus Publica*, *Concordia* and *Pax*. Most of the above mentioned were honours for a living man, bestowed by decree of the Senate.

And there were further honours: Young Caesar saved Rome from grave dangers and subsequently at all public and private banquets a libation was to be poured to him.<sup>29</sup> Horace clearly suggests that the libation was directed to Augustus: *te...adhibet deum*. The honour of pouring a libation in private to Young Caesar became a long-lasting practice, as the evidence of Horace and Petronius shows.<sup>30</sup> The libation is part of a list (51.19.4-7) grouping together the honours conferred after the arrival of the news of the capture of Alexandria on the 1<sup>st</sup> of August, 30 BCE. According to Gradel, the libation was connected to the private household *lares*, and there is no evidence that this ritual was ever performed before public banquets (2002, 207). This may be true, but it misses a vital point: the libation was a decree of the Senate. If accepted this would have been emperor worship, or something very close to it. It was declined, but nevertheless a decree of the Senate conspicuously offered to sanction the worship of Young Caesar in the city of Rome itself. Dio Cassius, however, never claims that this libation did equal emperor worship, as he emphasises that there was no worship of the living emperor in Italy and Rome (51.20.8); but this is of course wrong as this cult is attested throughout Italy.<sup>31</sup>

Just before his death Augustus went to Neapolis for quinquennial games (*Italica Romaia Sebasta Isolympia*), held in his honour (Dio Cass. 55.10.9; 56.29.2; Vell. Pat. 2.123.1). The fragmented inscription for the

games found at Olympia attest that there were offerings to the gods, including “to Augustus Caesar” and a temple of Augustus was involved.<sup>32</sup> Taylor emphasises the Greek nature of the city.<sup>33</sup> Even so, Augustus was present at the games just before his death in 14 CE (Dio Cass. 56.29.2, Vell. Pat. 2.123.1 and Suet. *Aug.* 98.5) and importantly, the citizens of Neapolis were Roman citizens (Cic. *Ball.* 21; Dart 2014, 177). Of importance is also the story of the crew of the corn ship from Alexandria at Puteoli, greeting Augustus in a religious manner.<sup>34</sup> What Suetonius shows is that Augustus received worship as a god from non-Romans,<sup>35</sup> as well as Romans (*Aug.* 98.5; *contra Aug.* 52?). The exception, according to Suetonius, was Rome.

During 29 BCE, before Young Caesar’s triumphant return to Rome, Greeks from Asia Minor and Bithynia visited Young Caesar in Asia. These petitioners wanted to establish a cult to the victor Young Caesar (Dio Cass. 51.20.6-8). Dio Cassius describes them as ‘strangers’ (*xenos/xenoi*); they were not Roman citizens (they were in fact from Dio Cassius’ own home province).<sup>36</sup> They were in effect at home, but are still described as strangers by Dio Cassius. It must be assumed that they were strangers to the Romans. This is viewed from the emperor’s point of view, whether this is down to Dio Cassius himself or reflects his sources. Dio Cassius states that there was no worship of the living emperor in Rome and Italy, but, as already pointed out, he is simply wrong with regard to Italy, whereas Rome is more complex and the answer ambiguous. I would like to suggest that he uses Augustus as his model emperor to rewrite the past, in order, it must be assumed, to influence contemporary politics. This particular example shows that Dio Cassius was not just a narrator, but shapes his history. According to Dio Cassius, Augustus had created a fictitious consensus on the matter of worship: the Romans were ‘commanded’ to worship Rome personified and the deified Caesar; the locals were ‘allowed’ to worship Augustus.

According to Gradel the cults in Italy

were private cults and thus of interest to Dio Cassius. In this sense he was right in suggesting that there was no worship of the living emperor in Italy, and his comments are allegedly identical to those of Suetonius (*Aug.* 52; 2002, 75). Gradel (2002, 76) concludes that Augustus had not dared to establish a cult that functioned on behalf of all of Italy, as an equivalent of the provincial cult.<sup>37</sup> But the more this is emphasised the more curious it appears that Dio Cassius mentions Italy, while Suetonius does not. This becomes even more complicated if we look at Tac. *Ann.* 1.10, although this may be a reference to the preparations for the state deification of Augustus.<sup>38</sup> Whatever the answer, Tacitus suggests that Augustus wanted (*vellet*) to be worshipped. And importantly, this is not what Dio Cassius says. This simply seems too much a construct and it contradicts with Dio Cassius’ comments on Maecenas’ Speech. Furthermore, it overlooks the difference between Romans and Hellenes in Dio Cassius 51.20.6-8. According to Dio Cassius no Roman should worship the living emperor, a distinction not made by Suetonius. This is hardly a question of technicalities.

The key to understanding these issues can be found in the Agrippa/Maecenas dialogue (52.2.1-13.7/52.14.1-40.2), which must in part be seen as relating to contemporary politics. The speeches are fictitious rhetorical pieces and Maecenas’ Speech outlines Dio Cassius’ own ideas. Part of the text consists of utopian reflections, but he also uses it to give an analysis of the problems facing Augustus. The speech enables Dio Cassius to present his idea that the best form of government was one which gave one man sole power. Importantly, he should rule with moderation, together with the Senate.<sup>39</sup> Dio Cassius also has Maecenas state that Young Caesar should never allow temples to be built in his honour (52.35.4). He continues by stating that in fact no man ever became a god by vote. There appears to be a contradiction between Dio Cassius’ views here and his description of the imperial policy in 51.20.6-8, where only the Romans are not

allowed to worship the living emperor. The answer may be found in 52.19.6:

I would like to go further, and say that all the citizens ought each to be given a share in the governing process: they should see themselves as being on an equal footing with us in this respect too, and so become our faithful allies, living as it were in a single city, our city (of Rome) [ὥσπερ τινὰ μίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν πόλιν οἰκοῦντες]] [Trans. Scott-Kilvert 1987].

These words are usually taken to reflect the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, extending Roman citizenship to free subjects in the Empire during the reign of Caracalla 212 CE.<sup>40</sup> Maecenas' Speech presents Dio Cassius' notion of emperor worship. During the reign of Augustus no Roman citizen took part in worship of the living emperor (Dio Cass. 51.20.6-8). This is untrue, but essential to the construct, because he needs his model emperor to create what is basically a constructed historical consensus on the issue of worship of the living emperor. The ideal and past consensus made only one conclusion possible for the contemporaries of Dio Cassius: after most free citizens had obtained citizenship by the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in 212 CE there ought to be no emperor worship at all, in accordance with the consensus of the model emperor Augustus. As rightly pointed out by Wienand (2012, 207) 212 CE also changed the perception of triumph and civil war, by way of the fact that Roman citizenship lost much of its meaning. Indeed, the sharp distinction between Romans and non-Romans, as presented by Dio Cassius, may be fictitious. In Suetonius the distinction is between Rome and the rest of the Empire. The more this distinction is emphasised, however, the more interesting the idea becomes that Dio Cassius thought of Italy as just another province, indeed as nothing special.<sup>41</sup>

Turning briefly to the structure of Dio Cassius' narrative, in books 51-53 he is seeking

to convey the establishment of monarchy at the very centre of his 80 book history. He rightly conceives it as both a single event – the Actium victory made Young Caesar the monarch – and a process extending down to 27 BCE.<sup>42</sup> Book 51 covers events from Actium in September 31 to 29; book 52 recounts the rest of 29 (the Agrippa-Maecenas debate). 51.1-17 follows Young Caesar's activity to the final defeat of Antonius and Cleopatra, including the conquest of Egypt, with the transition to 30 BCE at 4.3 (51.18 adds Young Caesar's ensuing activity in Syria). Dio Cassius then turns to "domestic events", such as the honours presented to Young Caesar in Rome between 31 and 29 (honours to the absent victor: 51.19.1-20.5; Lange 2009, 125-157). This reflects his typically fluid use of annalistic structure, in which domestic or external sections may continue the same story over several years. The year-transition to 29 occurs in the middle of this section (51.20.1). At 51.20.6 Dio Cassius returns to the activity of Young Caesar (marked by the opening "Kaisar"). The following section, 51.20.6-22.9, covers his movements in the rest of 29 BCE, through Asia and Greece and back to Rome and the triple triumph. This entire section relates to honours and celebrations. Dio Cassius then completes the book with 'other events' taking place in the period, including Statilius Taurus' amphitheatre (51.23.1, 30 BCE) and the campaigns of Crassus (51.23.2-27.3, 30-29 BC?). Once more he has followed an annalistic structure in his own fluid way.

However, he has also contrived to follow the account of Young Caesar's final victory in Egypt with a section which brings together honours and celebrations for the victories. And at 51.19.1-20.9 he has succeeded in juxtaposing the honours conferred at Rome with the divine honours conferred in Asia/Bithynia and (what Dio Cassius claims to be) Young Caesar's moderate response to these divine honours. Fascinatingly, the comparison of the Rome and Asian honours appears rather similar to the relief mentioned above, summarising the key deeds of Augustus: the battle of Actium and the triumph of 29 were



at the centre of his life. This is the reason Augustus was deified. Dio Cassius accordingly claims that even though Augustus undoubtedly deserved this cult, he nevertheless declined it. This way Dio Cassius turned Augustus into his model emperor with which he could construct a historical consensus on the issue of worship of the living emperor (while seemingly still close to the ideology of the Augustan regime).

Returning to the statues mentioned in *Res Gestae* 24, it appears that they were taken down because they were associated with emperor worship. Suetonius clearly imitates the *Res Gestae* in what he writes. This brings us to the chariot: here we should remember that Dio Cassius is wrong regarding cults in Italy to the living emperor, and even in Rome it was a complicated matter. According to Dio Cassius the *damnatio memoriae* of Antonius took place before his death, after the battle of Actium (51.19.3–5): this involved the tearing down or effacing of the memorials of Antonius, declaring his birthday (14 of January) *dies vitiosus* and forbidding the use of the name Marcus by any of his kin. The *damnatio* of Antonius was “an honour” that was declined by Young Caesar when arriving back in Rome. The names of Antonius and the *Antonii* were erased from the *Fasti Consulares* in 30 BCE, before Young Caesar’s return to Rome, at a time when the Senate had no reason to believe that this was a decision to which Young Caesar might object. A restoration was carried out after Young Caesar’s return to Rome in 29 BCE.<sup>43</sup>

I believe the chariot was also such an honour, declined by Young Caesar, but significantly it had already been set up in Rome by the orders of the Senate. Some statues may of course have been set up by others, even Greek cities, in imitation of the senatorial decree, not however the chariots. It was thus very difficult for Young Caesar to dispose of the chariots. The description of events in the *Res Gestae* may be a result of this problem, relying on his modesty as an explanation, perhaps even suggesting that outright worship was not acceptable in Rome. Alternatively, the

materials may only reveal extravagance, which was also unacceptable to Augustus. The solution came later, placing the/a chariot in the Forum Augustum – although probably not the same chariot, as it was melted down. It would have been strange to decline the chariot after Actium and then later again after the Parthian settlement. The Senate would hardly make the same mistake twice. This may indeed indicate that he did not decline it around 20 BCE, but only that it was postponed, to be put up in the Forum Augustum. Similarly, he probably did not decline the honour in 29 BCE, as it was already erected. Instead he had them melted down and presented them to Apollo, as a sign of his modesty. Clearly something later changed and the honour of a chariot became acceptable. Whatever the answer to this conundrum, the chariots were triumphal chariots and connected to triumphal and/or triumphal honours.

This honour may have imitated similar honours given to Philip and Alexander (Plin. *HN* 34.78).<sup>44</sup> Or alternatively, it was similar to the chariots dedicated to gods: Romulus had dedicated a chariot to Vulcanus after his second triumph over Cameria (Plut. *Rom.* 24.3). In either case, this would have been a divine honour and thus the chariot did not fit the policy of Young Caesar when he returned in 29. Again, we may refer back to the extreme honours presented to Caesar earlier, described by Dio Cassius as excessive (42.19), given without prior victory. Similarly, at 44.3 Dio Cassius describes the right to wear triumphal dress and the right to offer *spolia opima*, as if he had slain an enemy commander. The honour given to Young Caesar was associated it seems with both triumph and emperor worship at the same time. It was therefore declined and the chariot melted down (the processional chariot on the relief, as mentioned above, is not, however, the *quadriga* from the Forum Augustum, see Lange forthcoming 2016). The story we are told in *Res Gestae* 24 thus becomes very similar to the one in Dio Cassius (53.27.2–3), relating that Agrippa intended to erect a statue of Augustus in the Pantheon,

but the latter declined it. Whether this can be understood as a form of ruler worship without offending Roman sensibilities, honours were an important part of the Roman state.<sup>45</sup> They were used to negotiate between the emperor and his subjects, displaying loyalty, gratitude and support. The emperor in return had to show modesty by not accepting all, but without appearing ungrateful.

We may thus conclude that the honour given to Young Caesar after Actium and that presented to him in 20 BCE and realised in his forum in 2 BCE were not, or so it seems, entirely similar; or alternatively, Roman politics and society had changed in the meantime. Emperor worship was not so easy to decline after all, but perhaps the honour he did accept in 20 BCE was acceptable in a way the earlier honour had not been. If anything, this shows that we need to be careful when suggesting there was no worship for any living person in Rome, as the evidence is highly problematic, especially so in the case of Dio Cassius. What is clear, however, is that triumphal chariots

were associated with divine honours. During the reign of Augustus, triumphal honours and divine honours become interconnected. At first the triumphal chariot was declined, but later incorporated in the new forum of Augustus, until it finally became an essential part of the honours of Divus Augustus.<sup>46</sup> The reversed triumph at Augustus' funeral, as well as triumphal chariots and later the Claudian relief, tell the story of the deeds of Augustus: and his greatest achievement was the victory at Actium, including the 29 BCE triumph, and thus saving the citizens.<sup>47</sup> This is the reason Augustus was deified. They were also a symbol of Augustus' triumphal rulership. Dio Cassius was certainly wrong when dismissing cult to the living Augustus in Italy; but even in Rome this issue was considerably more complex than was previously believed.

Carsten Hjort Lange  
Aalborg University  
lange@cgs.aau.dk

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beard, M.  
2007 *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge Mass. & London.

Clark, A.  
2007 *Divine Qualities. Cult and Community in Republican Rome* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford

Cooley, A.E.  
2009 *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge.

Dart, C.J.  
2014 *The Social War, 91 to 88 BCE. A History of the Italian Insurgency against the Roman Republic*, Farnham.

De Blois, L.  
1998 "Emperor and Empire in the World of Greek-speaking Authors of the Third Century AD". In: Schwerdtfeger, S. & Ilchmann, U. (hergs.) *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34.4, 3391-3443.

Degrassi, A.  
1947 *Inscriptiones Italiae*, 13/1. *Fasti Consulares et Triumphales*, Roma.

Fejfer, J.  
2008 *Roman Portraits in Context (Image and Context 2)*, Berlin & New York.

- Gradel, I.  
1992 "Mamia's Dedication: Emperor and *Genius*. The Imperial Cult in Italy and the *Genius Coloniae* in Pompeii", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 20, 43–58.
- Gradel, I.  
2002 *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (Oxford Classical Monographs), Oxford.
- Holliday, P. J.  
2002 *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*, Cambridge.
- Hölscher, T.  
1994 "Claudische Staatsdenkmäler in Rom und Italien. Neue Schritte zur Festigung des Principats". In: Strocka, V.M. (ed.), *Die Regierungszeit des Kaisers Claudius (41-54 n. Chr). Umbruch oder Episode?*, Mainz am Rhein, 91-105.
- Koeppel, G.  
1999 "A Historical Relief from Rome and Considerations on *tensae* and the *pulvinar*" ("Review of *Teile eines historischen Frieses in der Casa de pilatos in Sevilla*. Mit einem Exkurs zur *Tensa* by Sabine G Szidat"), *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 12, 596-599.
- Koortbojian, M.  
2013 *The Divinization of Caesar and Augustus. Precedents, Consequences, Implications*, Cambridge.
- Kuttner, A.L.  
1995 *Dynasty and Empire in the Age of Augustus. The Case of the Boscoreale Cups*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & Oxford.
- La Rocca, E.  
2013 *Augusto*, Milano.
- Lange, C.H.  
2009 *Res Publica Constituta: Actium, Apollo and the Accomplishment of the Triumviral Assignment* (*Impact of Empire* 10), Leiden & Boston.
- Lange, C.H.  
2012 "Constantine's Civil War Triumph of AD 312 and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition", *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici* 37, 29-53.
- Lange, C.H.  
2013 "Triumph and Civil War in the Late Republic", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 81, 67-90.
- Lange, C.H.  
2015 "Augustus' Triumphal and Triumph-like Returns". In: Östenberg, I. et al. (eds.), *The Moving City. Processions, Passages and Promenades in Ancient Rome* (Bloomsbury Classical Studies Monographs), London, 133-143, 282-286.
- Lange, C.H.  
2016 (forthcoming) *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War: the Late Republic and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition*, London.
- Lott, J.B.  
2004 *The Neighborhoods of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- Madigan, B.  
2013 *The Ceremonial Sculptures of the Roman Gods* (*Monumenta Graeca et Romana* 20), Leiden & Boston.
- Madsen, J.M.  
2016 (forthcoming ) "Cassius Dio and the Cult of Iulius and Roma at Ephesus and Nicaea (51.20.6-8)", *Classical Quarterly* 66/1.
- McCormick, M.  
1986 *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West*, Cambridge.
- Mommsen, T.  
1887 *Römisches Staatsrecht* (*Handbuch der Römischen Altertümer* 1), vol. I, Leipzig.
- Murray, W.M.  
2012 *The Age of the Titans. The Rise and Fall of the Great Hellenistic Navies*, Oxford.
- Pekáry, T.  
1975 "*Statuae Meae...argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter, quas ipse sustuli*. Interpretationen zu Res

- gestae divi Augusti 24". In: Lefèvre, E. (ed.), *Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur augusteischen Zeit. Kieler Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag*, Amsterdam, 96-108.
- Reinhold, M.  
1988 *From Republic to Principate. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 49-52 (36-29 B.C.)* (*American Philological Association, monograph series 54*), Atlanta.
- Rich, J.W.  
1990 *The Augustan Settlement (Roman History 53-55.9)* by Cassius Dio, Warminster.
- Rich, J.W.  
1998 "Augustus's Parthian Honours, the Temple of Mars Ultor and the Arch in the Forum Romanum", *Papers of the British School at Rome* 66, 71-128.
- Rich, J.W. & Williams, J.H.C.  
1999 "Leges et Iura P.R. Restituit: A New Aureus of Octavian and the Settlement of 28-27BC", *The Numismatic Chronicle* 159, 169-213.
- Schäfer, T.  
2002 "Römisches Relief mit Tensa", *Bulletin du Musée Hongrois des Beaux-Arts* 96, 31-49.
- Schäfer, T.  
2013 "Ciclo di rilievi Medinaceli". In: La Rocca, E. et al. (a cura di), *Augusto*, Milano, 321-323, cat. nr. IX.5.1-11.
- Scott-Kilvert, I.  
1987 *The Roman History: The Reign of Augustus*, by Cassius Dio, London.
- Spannagel, M.  
1999 *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums* (*Archäologie und Geschichte* 9), Heidelberg.
- Stewart, P.  
2003 *Statues in Roman Society. Representation and Response* (*Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation*), Oxford.
- Swan, P.M.  
2004 *The Augustan Succession. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 55-56 (9 B.C. - A.D.14)* (*American Philological Association, American Classical Studies 47*), Oxford.
- Szidat, S.G.  
1997 *Teile eines historischen Frieses in der Casa de Pilatos in Sevilla. Mit einem Exkurs zur Tensa*, München.
- Taylor, L.R.  
1931 *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*, Middletown.
- Trunk, M.  
2002 *Die 'Casa de Pilatos' in Sevilla. Studien zu Sammlung, Aufstellung und Rezeption antiker Skulpturen im Spanien des 16. Jhs.* (*Madrider Beiträge* 28), Mainz am Rhein.
- Trunk, M.  
2010 "Batalla y triunfo: Los relieves históricos de la colección del primer Duque de Alcalá". In: Abascal, J.M. & Cebrián, R. (eds.), *Escultura romana en Hispania VI. Homenaje a Eva Koppel*, Murcia, 27-44.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A.  
2010 *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, 2.ed., Cambridge.
- Wardle, D.  
2012 "Suetonius on Augustus as God and Man", *The Classical Quarterly* 62, 307-326.
- Weinstock, S.  
1971 *Divus Julius*, Oxford.
- Wienand, J.  
2012 *Der Kaiser als Sieger. Metamorphosen triumphaler Herrschaft unter Constantin I* (*Klio Beiheft, Neue Folge* 19), Berlin.
- Ziolkowski, A.  
2009 "What did Agrippa's Pantheon look like? New Answers to an Old Question". In: G. Graßhoff, G., Heinzelmann, M. & Wäfler, M. (eds.), *The Pantheon in Rome* (*Bern Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*), Bern, 29-39.



## NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all translations are those of the Loeb Classical Library, with minor corrections.
- <sup>2</sup> See Lange 2015, on Augustus' triumphal and triumph-like returns.
- <sup>3</sup> Schäfer 2002, esp. 47-48; 2013, 321 for a Claudian date, based on style (cf. Koeppel 1999; Lange forthcoming 2016).
- <sup>4</sup> On *exuviae*, see Madigan 2013, 83-101. Pliny (*HN* 7.145) refers to the bearing of the *insignia* of Jupiter in triumph, calling them *exuviae*. For the processional wagon with the attributes of the gods, see Festus 500 L: Cic. 2. *Verr.* 1.154; Suet. *Vesp.* 5.7 (Jupiter). See also Dion. Hal. 7.72; Dio Cass. 47.40.4; 50.8.2; 66.1.3; Val. Max. 1.1.16. For an *aedes thesaurum* on the Capitol, see ILS 1987. On *tensae*, see mainly Szidat 1997; Spannagel 1999, 87; Trunk 2002; 2010; Schäfer 2002; 2013.
- <sup>5</sup> Cf. the Constantinian panels on the Constantine arch show the siege of Verona and the Battle of the Milvian Bridge and depict Roman soldiers fighting one other. See Lange 2012; forthcoming 2016.
- <sup>6</sup> Schäfer 2002, 49; Murray 2012, 247; cf. Hölscher 1994, 100; *contra* Trunk 2010, 36.
- <sup>7</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 100.2; Tac. *Ann.* 1.8.3; Dio Cass. 56.42.1; Suet. *Iul.* 84.4: the funeral of Caesar similarly contained equipment from his triumphs, although in an altogether more chaotic procession. For a more developed argument of the triumphal relief, see Lange forthcoming 2016.
- <sup>8</sup> By the time of Dio Cassius the word *Divus* was used for dead emperors, deified by the Senate. See Gradel 2002, 63-64.
- <sup>9</sup> See Swan 2004, 299 for a tentative chronology from Augustus' death to his consecration.
- <sup>10</sup> Kuttner 1995, 147-148, and illustration 10, and see coin page 183 in La Rocca 2013; *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 98.
- <sup>11</sup> Rich 1998, 115-119.
- <sup>12</sup> *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 393, 313 = *BMCR* 38-39, 55.
- <sup>13</sup> Rich 1998, 119. For Young Caesar's ovations, see *RG* 4.1; Suet. *Aug.* 22.1; Degrassi, 1947: 86-87, 568-569; *Fasti Barb.*, see Degrassi 1947, 342-343. The Senate also bestowed triumphal honours, linked to his triumph-like returns: they became substitute-honours replacing the triumph proper (see Lange 2015).
- <sup>14</sup> Dio Cass. 44.4.2; Weinstock 1971, 57, 273-274; Rich 1998, 119. This honour must have been part of the same batch of honours.
- <sup>15</sup> Rich 1998, 121-122; *RG* 35.1; *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 258-259 = *BMCR* 590-591.
- <sup>16</sup> Dio Cass. 43.14.6; Weinstock 1971, 54-59; Rich 1998, 120.
- <sup>17</sup> Dio Cass. 49.18.6; Weinstock 1971, 56 suggests that Young Caesar had himself already received this honour after Naulochus.
- <sup>18</sup> Weinstock 1971, 56, pl. 5, 12-14. See also Holliday 2002, 22-62, on images of triumph in general.
- <sup>19</sup> *BMCR* 382, 392, 401; Rich 1998, 116: Parthian honour.
- <sup>20</sup> *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 258-259 = *BMCR* 590-591.
- <sup>21</sup> Already in 19/18 BCE Augustus had been honoured as *pater* or *parens* (see Cooley 2009, 273) See *RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> 96-101: *PARENTI(I) CONS(ERVATORI) SVO*. The triumphal image accompanying this legend points to military victory and triumph, in this case most likely referring back to the saving of the country from Antonius and Cleopatra. Interestingly, the imperial *divi* were acknowledged as *patres* (see Koortbojian 2013, 29).
- <sup>22</sup> For *currum* (*RG* 4.1), see Weinstock 1971: esp. 54-59; Beard 2007: 124-128, 223.
- <sup>23</sup> Pekáry 1975, 108.
- <sup>24</sup> Stewart 2003, 128 suggests modesty; for statues in gold and silver, see Fejfer 2008, 166-168, 384 on modesty.
- <sup>25</sup> There is no name, but he is male; see Lange 2009, esp. 139.
- <sup>26</sup> Weinstock 1971, 56.
- <sup>27</sup> See also Mommsen 1887.1, 393-395: further examples are from religious rituals.
- <sup>28</sup> See Clark 2007, who argues that these are not just divine qualities.
- <sup>29</sup> 30 BCE: Dio Cass. 51.19.7; *contra* Reinhold 1988, 151, disagreeing that this was cult. Gradel 2002, 207-212, at 207 writes: "In one case of worship of the emperor certainly entered the *domus*, not informally and on individual initiative only, but by decree of the Senate", and also dismisses the old red herring that it was performed to the emperor's *Genius* (209).
- <sup>30</sup> Hor. *Carm.* 4.5.31-36; Petron. *Sat.* 60. Marius had been honoured in the same way, but spontaneously, not by Senate decree, as an expression of the popular belief that he had saved Rome from the Gauls (Val. Max. 8.15.7; Plut. *Mar.* 27.5). For the *Genius* discussion, see also Wardle 2012, 308-312. Lott 2004, 106-117 emphasises that the cult to the *lares* reveal no archaeological sign of *Genius*. Contrary to this Taylor 1931, 180-191 uses Ovid (*Fast.* 5.145-146), suggesting that the cult was to the *Genius* of Augustus. See Lott 2004, esp. 111-114. He does however support the idea that the libation was to the *Genius* of Augustus (2004, 111).
- <sup>31</sup> Gradel 2002, esp. 80-91; Koortbojian 2013, esp. 165-170.
- <sup>32</sup> See Gradel 2002, 81-82.
- <sup>33</sup> Taylor 1931, 214-215: she dismisses the games, claiming that they do not show that there was cult to the living emperor in Italy, basing her argument on Dio Cassius' statements on emperor worship; cf. Wallace-Hadrill 2010, 38-70 (on dress), 278-279: this does not betray Augustus as a Roman, but rather defines it.

- <sup>34</sup> Suet. *Aug.* 98.2; Lange 2009, 191; Wardle 2012, 320.
- <sup>35</sup> Rightly so Wardle 2012, 322.
- <sup>36</sup> Dio Cassius refers to *xenos/xenoi* to non-citizens in opposition to citizens at 60.15.6; 64.8.2, 2; 77.9.5 (all from the epitomes of Xiphilinos).
- <sup>37</sup> For private versus public, see also Koortbojian 2013, esp. 158-160, 165-170, 192-198. He ignores the libation from Rome.
- <sup>38</sup> Gradel 2002, 277.
- <sup>39</sup> Rich 1990, 14-15; Swan 2004, 28.
- <sup>40</sup> Reinhold 1988, 189-90. See also Madsen (forthcoming), who reaches a similar conclusion concerning 212 CE by a different route.
- <sup>41</sup> De Blois 1998, 3407-3409.
- <sup>42</sup> For the settlement as a process, contrary to Dio Cassius (53.2.6–22.5), who presented it as a single act carried out in a meeting of the Senate in 27 BCE, see Rich and Williams 1999: an aureus issued in 28 BCE suggests that one of the elements Augustus claimed to have transferred to the control of the Senate and the Roman people (RG 34.1) were the laws (*LEGES ET IVRA P R RESTITVTI*).
- <sup>43</sup> Lange 2009, 136-140. Cf. the restoration of the equestrian statues of Sulla and Pompeius destroyed by the plebs (Suet. *Iul.* 75.4; Dio Cass. 42.18.2).
- <sup>44</sup> Or Demetrius Poliorcetes (Diod. Sic. 20.46.2; see Weinstock 1971, 55 for more evidence. Cicero even went as far as to protest when the Cilicians sought to set up a chariot in his honour (*Att.* 5.21.7).
- <sup>45</sup> Rich 1990, 163; Ziolkowski 2009, esp. 37 suggests regarding Dio Cassius' statement: "But how can a report (or gossip, or a surmise) of an unrealized intention, telling most forcibly what the Pantheon never was, be treated as a key to the meaning its founder actually conferred on it?" Ziolkowski does however not take into account that Dio Cassius was against ruler worship. Neither does he accept the value of declining honours. See also Koortbojian 2013, 134-136. The idea that the Pantheon was a victory monument of Agrippa is, however, absurd. The victories belonged to Augustus.
- <sup>46</sup> See also: Tiberian coins (*RIC* 1<sup>2</sup> Tiberius 54, 60, 66) do not show a processional wagon or *tensa*, but a triumphal chariot without a driver.
- <sup>47</sup> For saving the lives of citizens (from civil war and foreign threats). The honour was presented to Augustus on the 13th of January (EJ, p. 45).